

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent telephonic interview held on August 28. The claim amendments and arguments submitted in this paper are consistent with the amendments and arguments presented during the course of the interview. Accordingly, entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Final Office Action mailed August 3, 2007 considered claims 1-27. Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by "Slennox's eggdrop page" hereinafter *Slennox* in view of "BotnetCentral-Your source for Eggdrop related Stuff" hereinafter *BotnetCentral* in further view of Tsurikov et al. (US 2001/0014852) hereinafter *Tsurikov*.¹

By this amendment claims 1, 12, 21, 26 and 27 have been amended.² Claims 1-27 are pending, of which claims 1, 12, 21, 26 and 27 are the only independent claims at issue.

The present invention is generally directed to including and communicating with a software resource as a member of a chat session. For example, claim 1 defines receiving a first request to add a first software resource to an online chat session from a first member of the online chat session, each of the plurality of software resources being available to participate in the online chat session, when added by a chat session member. Next, claim 1 defines receiving a second request to add a second software resource to the online chat session from a second member of the online chat session.

Claim 1 further defines including both the first software resource and the second software resource, along with the plurality of computer users, as members in a group of online chat participants, each member in the group of chat participants, including the software resources, capable of sending a plain language message relating to the specified subject being discussed to all the other members in the group of chat participants, including those software resources that have been added by online chat session members including at least the first and second software resources. Next, claim 1 defines one of the plurality of computer users transmitting the plain language message to a plurality of members of the group of online chat participants, including

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

² Support for the amendments to the claims are found throughout the specification and previously presented claims, including but not limited to paragraphs [0031], [0040], [0048] and Figures 2 & 4.

the plurality of software resources that have been added by online chat session members. Next, claim 1 defines the first software resource receiving from a member of the group of chat participants a submission of a plain language message related to the specified subject being discussed. Next, claim 1 defines the first software resource parsing each received plain language message to generate a query for data related to the specified subject being discussed, the parsing performed solely in response to receiving the plain language messages.

Claim 1 further defines the first software resource submitting the generated query to at least one database to obtain data specific to the subject being discussed. Next, claim 1 defines the first software resource receiving a response to the query from at least one of the at least one databases. Next, claim 1 defines the first software resource determining a plain language response to the message based on the received database response, the plain language response being related to the subject being discussed. Lastly, claim 1 defines the first software resource transmitting the plain language response back to all of the members of the group of chat participants, including the member that submitted the plain language message and including at least one other member that did not submit the plain language message, thus enabling each member of the group of chat participants to equally interact with the software resource as another participant in the online chat session, by responding to the plain language message relating to the specified subject being discussed.

Claims 10 and 11 are computer program product claims corresponding to performing different portions of claim 1. Claims 12 is a method claim similar from claim 1, from the perspective of a messaging program. Claim 21 is a system claim corresponding to claim 1. Claim 26 is an apparatus claim corresponding to claim 1. Claim 27 is an apparatus claim corresponding to claim 12.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise render the amended claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose, suggest, or enable each and every element of these claims.

As discussed during the interview, *Slennox* describes an internet relay chat (IRC) bot known as "Eggdrop" that provides advanced IRC channel management and flexibility for adding scripts and other bots (see "What is an Eggdrop?" lines 24-29). Eggdrop bots typically sit in an IRC channel appearing like a regular user. The bots usually remain idle until called upon to perform a particular function (e.g. add or kick a user, prevent spam and maintaining the channel

op-list (list of operators that have privileges to interact with and control the bot) (see "What is an Eggdrop" lines 3-6). An operator can input commands into Eggdrop via a chat interface (usually direct client-to-client (DCC)) using a ":" before each command. However, regular, non-operator users are not permitted to interact with or control the bot (see "Using your Eggdrop" lines 14-17). Furthermore, when an operator is sending commands to an Eggdrop bot, other users in the same chat room do not receive replies from the bot – only the operator receives replies from the bot. Along those same lines, when an operator sends a command or inquiry to the Eggdrop bot, chat room users do not see the command/inquiry nor do they respond to it.

BotnetCentral teaches allowing an Eggdrop administrator to set up a command to which the Eggdrop bot will respond. *BotnetCentral* teaches using the !trigger command to perform a user-specified action. For example, the user can specify that, upon receiving the !trigger command, the Eggdrop bot should send a notice to (username), send a private message to (username) and/or send a public message to (channelname). The administrator can also specify who among the Eggdrop users has access to this command.

Tsourikov teaches searching for keywords, then semantically processing candidate documents for specific knowledge concepts (par. [0008]). For example, a user enters natural language relating to a subject. The system performs a semantic analysis of the language, tagging each word as a subject, action or object (SAO). The system then generates keywords for each sentence based on SAO identifiers. The system performs the same SAO analysis for each sentence documents that have a higher likelihood of matching the user's natural language search (pars. [0008]-[0013]). After searching for potential matches, the system filters out the least relevant documents and provides a summary, in natural language, of the documents that have the highest incidences of SAO matches to the subjects, actions and objects of the natural language search (pars. [0045]-[0046]).

However, as discussed during the interview, none of the cited art teaches or suggests receiving a first request to add a first software resource to an online chat session from a first member of the online chat session, each of the plurality of software resources being available to participate in the online chat session, when added by a chat session member and receiving a second request to add a second software resource to the online chat session from a second member of the online chat session, as recited in claim 1.

Also, as discussed during the interview, none of the cited art teaches or suggests one of the plurality of computer users transmitting the plain language message to a plurality of members of the group of online chat participants, including the plurality of software resources that have been added by online chat session members, as recited in claim 1.

Lastly, as discussed during the interview, none of the cited art teaches or suggests, among other things, the first software resource parsing each received plain language message to generate a query for data related to the specified subject being discussed, the parsing performed solely in response to receiving the plain language messages. At least for any of these reasons, claim 1 patentably defines over the art of record. At least for any of these reasons, claims 12, 21, 26 and 27 also patentably define over the art of record. Since each of the dependent claims depend from one of claims 1, 12, 21, 26 and 27, each of the dependent claims also patentably define over the art of record for at least either of the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

Dated this 3rd day of October, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/GREGORY R. LUNT/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
MICHAEL B. DODD
Registration No. 46,437
GREGORY R. LUNT
Registration No. 57,354
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:MBD:crb
CRB0000006351V001